

**Snohomish County Planning and Development Services
Docket XVII Initial Review and Evaluation of Docketing
Proposal to the GMA Comprehensive Plan
March 29, 2013**

Applicant: City of Sultan

File: SLN2

12-109658-DA

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

**GPP FLUM Designations
and Urban Growth Area
(UGA) adjustments:**

Proposed removal: Remove 380 acres from the Sultan UGA and redesignate from Urban Low Density Residential (ULDR) to Rural Residential (RR)

Proposed addition 1: Add 138 acres to the Sultan UGA and redesignate from RR and Rural Urban Transition Area (RUTA) to ULDR

Proposed addition 2: Add 76 acres to the Sultan UGA and redesignate from RR and RUTA to ULDR

Zoning:

Proposed removal: Rezone 380 acres from R-7,200 & R-9,600 to R-5

Proposed addition 1: Rezone 138 acres from R-5 to R-7,200

Proposed addition 2: Rezone 76 acres from R-5 to R-7,200

Acres:

UGA removal area total: 380 acres

UGA addition area 1: 138 acres

UGA addition area 2: 76 acres

Total: 214 acres

SITE RELATED INFORMATION

Location:	UGA removal -	NW portion of the Sultan UGA in the area of Trout Farm Road and east of the Sultan River.
	UGA addition 1 -	North of the Sultan UGA, SW and SE corners of the intersection of Sultan Basin Road and 124 th St SE.
	UGA addition 2 -	East of the Sultan UGA, east of 339 th Ave SE (Rice Road) and north of 140 th St. SE.
Existing Land Use:	UGA removal -	Large and small parcel rural residential.
	UGA addition 1 -	Large parcel rural residential
	UGA addition 2 -	Large parcel rural residential
Adjacent Land Use:	UGA removal -	North/northeast - commercial forest lands; west – rural residential; south/southeast – city of Sultan and single family development.
	UGA addition 1 -	North/northeast – rural residential; southeast, south, west and northwest – primarily vacant parcels within the UGA with one single family residential subdivision west of the site within the city limits.
	UGA addition 2 -	North – commercial forest lands; east – large lot rural residential; south and west – single family residential within the UGA.
Site Characteristics:	UGA removal -	Mix of forested and open areas along the Sultan River with very steep slopes along the eastern edge of the site.
	UGA addition 1 -	Mix of forested and open areas; moderate grade with steep slopes along western portion of site.
	UGA addition 2 -	Relatively flat grade with moderate slopes along the north boundary; primarily open pasture land; Wagleys Creek flows north to south through the site.

Infrastructure:

The UGA removal site is accessed by 307th Ave. SE and Trout Farm Road and is within the city's public water service area. No sanitary sewer service is available to the removal site. Residences in the removal site rely on-site sewage disposal systems.

The Sultan Basin Road, a minor arterial is the primary access road to UGA Addition 1. No significant impacts were identified to county roads as a result of this addition. However, there may be local impacts to city streets and SR2.

339th Ave. SE (Rice Road), a collector arterial, is the primary access road to UGA Addition 2. No significant impacts were identified to county roads as a result of this addition. However, there may be local impacts to city streets and SR2.

The two UGA addition sites currently rely on individual wells and on-site sewage disposal systems. The city states that public water and sanitary sewers can reasonably be extended to serve these two sites.

Critical Areas:

UGA removal – Sultan River 100-year floodplain is located along the west portion of the site; steep slopes along the east portion of the site; lake and stream in the north portion of the site.

UGA addition 1 - Steep slopes along west portion of site

UGA addition 2 – Wagleys Creek flows north to south through the site

EVALUATION

PDS shall conduct an initial review and evaluation of proposed amendments and assess the extent of review that would be required under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). PDS shall recommend to the county council that an amendment be further processed only if all of the following criteria are met, except as provided in SCC 30.74.040.

Initial Review and Evaluation Criteria (SCC 30.74.030(1)):

Criterion “a”: The proposed amendment is consistent with the countywide planning policies (CPPs), the multicounty planning policies (MPPs), the Growth Management Act (GMA), and other applicable state and federal laws.

Yes. The proposed adjustment of the UGA boundaries by the city of Sultan is consistent with the GMA, the MPPs, and the CPPs.

GMA

The proposal is consistent with the UGA requirements in RCW 36.70A.110(3):

(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas . . .

The primary purpose of Sultan's proposed adjustments to the UGA boundaries is to include only those areas where infrastructure, particularly roads, sewer and water, can be adequately provided. According to Sultan, the isolated nature of the proposed UGA removal area would require costly road and utility improvements in order to provide urban levels of service. The city states that the areas proposed for addition to the UGA can more cost effectively be served by public sewer and water.

MPPs

The proposal is consistent with following *Vision 2040* MPP:

DP-1 Provide a regional framework for the designation and adjustment of the urban growth area to ensure long-term stability and sustainability of the urban growth area consistent with the regional vision.

The proposed adjustment to the Sultan UGA is consistent with the MPP DP-1 which allows for adjustments to UGAs in order to plan for more efficient land uses and infrastructure to better accommodate population and employment growth within a UGA.

CPPs

The proposal is consistent with CPP DP-3:

Following consultation with the affected city or cities, the County may adjust urban growth areas – defined in this policy as concurrent actions to expand an Urban Growth Area (UGA) in one location while contracting the same UGA in another location – without resulting in net increase of population or employment land capacity. Such action may be permitted when consistent with adopted policies and the following conditions:

- a. The area being removed from the UGA is not already characterized by urban development, and without active permits that would change it to being urban in character; and*
- b. The land use designation(s) assigned in the area removed from the UGA shall be among the existing rural or resource designations in the comprehensive plan for Snohomish County.*

Sultan's proposed UGA adjustments will not result in a net increase of population land capacity. For the proposed UGA removal area, there would be a population reduction

of 655. The two proposed addition areas would add a total population of 655. This adjustment would result in no net increase in population land capacity. The residential densities used in the land capacity analysis were derived from Snohomish County Tomorrow's draft 2012 Buildable Lands Report.

The city's proposal is consistent with conditions "a" and "b" for adjusting UGAs under CPP DP-3. The proposed removal area is characterized by single family rural residences that are served by individual on-site sewage disposal systems. There are no active permits for urban development as the area is not served by urban infrastructure, including sanitary sewers. The RR land use designation assigned to the area proposed for removal from the UGA is an existing rural land use designation in the GPP.

Criterion "b": Any proposed change in the designation of agricultural lands, forest lands, and mineral resource lands is consistent with the designation criteria of the GMA and the comprehensive plan.

N/A. This criterion is not applicable. The proposal will not change any GMA resource lands designation.

Criterion "c": If the proposed amendment has been reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal, circumstances related to the current proposal have significantly changed and support a plan or regulation change at this time.

N/A. The proposed amendment has not been previously reviewed by the planning commission or county council as part of a previous proposal.

Criterion "d": If the next docket cycle to be set is limited to minor amendments by SCC 30.74.015(2)(a), the proposal satisfies all of the following conditions:

N/A. This criterion is not applicable to the proposal since Docket XVII, the next docket cycle to be set, is scheduled for processing of both major and minor amendments according to SCC 30.74.015(2)(c).

Initial Review of Rezone Requests (SCC 30.74.040):

(1) The rezone request is for an implementing zone consistent with a concurrent proposed amendment to the future land use map that meets the criteria of SCC 30.74.030.

Yes. Since the rezone requests are for implementing zones consistent with the concurrent proposed future land use map amendments that meet the criteria of SCC 30.74.030(1), the proposed rezones are consistent with this criterion.

(2) Public facilities and services necessary for development of the site, as defined in applicable capital facilities plans, are available or programmed to be provided consistent with the comprehensive plan and development regulations as determined by applicable service providers.

Yes. According to Sultan, public facilities and services, including sewer and water, will be programmed to serve the proposed UGA additions and would be provided by the city.

(3) Site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.

Yes. A site plan approval would not be required concurrent with the rezone under chapters 30.31A, 30.31B, or 30.31F SCC.

Summary of Consistency with Review Criteria

Consistent with Initial Docket Review Criteria: SCC 30.74.030(1)				Consistent with Rezone Criteria: SCC 30.74.040		
"a"	"b"	"c"	"d"	"1"	"2"	"3"
Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y

Recommendation:

According to SCC 30.74.030 and 30.74.040, PDS is required to recommend to the county council that proposed docket amendments be further processed only if all of the initial review and evaluation criteria are met. The city of Sultan docket proposal **does** meet all of the applicable initial review and evaluation criteria, therefore, PDS recommends that the proposal be further processed.